IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 21ST NOVEMBER 2007 / 30TH KARTHIKA 1929

RP.No. 885 of 2007(E) IN W.A.No.1842 of 2007

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WA.1842/2007 Dated 18/08/2007

.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/3RD RESPONDENT IN W.A/3RD RESPONDENT:

C.D.JOY,
CHEMMAYATH HOUSE,
NEDUMPAL, THOTTIPAL,
THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS1-2 & APPELLANT:RESPONDENTS 1-2 & PETITIONER:

---

1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, THRISSUR,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

2. THE SECRETARY,
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
THRISSUR.

3. SRI. V.V.ANILKUMAR,
VELLAMPARAMBIL HOUSE, P.O.PALAZHI,
(VIA)PUDUKKAD,
THRISSUR.

R1 & R2 BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.MEERA.
R3 BY ADV. SRI.P.RAVINDRAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 21/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

H.L.DATTU, C.J. & K.T.SANKARAN, J.

--- ----------

R.P.No.885 of 2007 in W.A.No.1842 of 2007

---------- ----------

Dated, this the 21st day of November, 2007

ORDER

H.L.Dattu, C.J.

This review petition is filed to review the orders passed by us in W.A.No.1842 of 2007 dated 18th August, 2007.

(2). In the review petition it is stated that, the order is passed by this Court without hearing the third respondent in the writ appeal.

(3). In our order at para 4, we had made it clear that the Regional Transport Authority, Thrissur would consider the representations said to have been filed by the petitioner dated 23-11-2006 and 4-6-2007, after hearing the petitioner as well the third respondent.

(4). In our opinion, if we permit the review petitioner/third respondent in the writ appeal to raise even the contention with regard to the maintainability of the representations said to have been filed by the petitioner, that would serve the purpose. Therefore, the following:

ORDER

(i). The Review Petition is disposed of.

(ii). The review petitioner/third respondent apart from others is also permitted to raise the contention with regard to the maintainability of the representations said to have been filed by the petitioner before the Regional Transport Authority, Thrissur is concerned.

(5). With the above observations and directions the Review Petition is disposed of.

Ordered accordingly.

(**H.L.DATTU)**
CHIEF JUSTICE

(K.T.SANKARAN)
JUDGE

MS